about why he believes that Mojo is similar to 1 WealthTV, that's his business. in He's 2 competition with Mojo. He's every 3 about programming. They 4 thinking meetings every week to say what programs 5 should we put on? What kind of stuff is our 6 competition doing? Who can we sell this to? 7 what he does. He's is 8 This learned it from running the business. 9 not saying that I know this by virtue of my 10 expertise or anything in particular other than 11 running this business. And that's the kind of 12 lay testimony that is let in and given the 13 relaxed standards here for an administrative 14 proceeding, the D.C. Circuit's standard in 15 EchoStar, it doesn't matter if it's hearsay. 16 He doesn't have to know it personally. 17 The Administrative Judge isn't a 18 This is susceptible to the kind of 19 jury. prejudice from seeing somebody with a Ph.D. 20 come up and say something that the Daubert 21

gatekeeper function is meant to insulate a

jury from that kind of prejudice.

Because Your Honor is an expert in hearings and an expert in the subject matter, you can weigh for yourself whether this stuff is relevant or not. You can give it whatever credit you think it's worth and that's essentially what the Courts have done in administrative hearings and what we're asking you to do here.

A few specifics, Mr. Cohen correctly mentions a few newspaper articles and blogs, there are a few things of that nature. But much of the hearsay in this case is Defendants' own exhibits. There's no surprise. There isn't really factual dispute about a lot of this stuff. They do put on these programs. They do have these people on them. They do look similar.

Yes, an expert can look at it and say I've reviewed thousands and thousands of hours of reels and I found statistical correlations. And a programming executive can

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

look at it and say well, I normally review programming this way and this is how a programming executive does it. An ad seller can say well, this is the kind of things my customers like to buy. They like to buy programming of this sort, put these kinds of ads on.

And a business owner can say I develop programming to suit the carriers. I develop programming to compete with these kinds of programs. I develop programming to satisfy programming executives. There are three different perspectives on the same thing. Are they cumulative? Yes, to some extent. But there's no particular reason not to let them in.

The other point they seem to be making is a point of surprise, the 2000 amendments to Rule 701, mentioned in their briefs. Essentially, the Court -- I mean the Rules Committee added in a third portion to 701 saying not only does it have to be on

2.0

personal perception, not only does it have to be helpful to the Court, but it also cannot be on matters of scientific expertise requiring specialized reasoning processes. For statistics, you'd want to be a statistician. For medicine, you'd want to have a medical degree. These aren't those kinds of processes.

marketing. Is it going to appeal to this audience? Is it going to appeal to that audience? Yes, there are people who make a living doing that, but it's not the kind of expertise that requires special scientific training. And we don't think it should be excluded.

JUDGE SIPPEL: You do have -well, what about -- before I get to that, what
about this question. There was a schedule set
up for identifying experts and there was a
mishap, I know, with one of the first experts.
And that Palmer was replaced by Ms. McGovern.

and we made an exception in 1 So scheduling to accommodate that. 2 So why didn't we have this witness 3 proffered as an expert at that time? 4 MR. ROSE: Well, we thought that 5 as the operator of the business, he can talk 6 about what he did in the business, in the 7 8 kinds of analyses he did. Yes, there's a paragraph or two 9 that Mr. Cohen properly points out could be 10 characterized as rebuttal and maybe those 11 couple of paragraphs ought to be kept out. 12 But the vast majority of this stuff was in the 13 pleadings before the Media Bureau and there's 14 a separate question that will probably come up 15 today as to whether those pleadings are 16 properly in the record or whether the record 17 is effectively expunged and starting from 18 19 scratch. the obviously think that 20 We pleadings are already there and there isn't a 21

particularly good reason. In any event,

there's no surprise to Defendant. He's been telling the same story since he started this proceeding. He's been saying they're similar. He's got a little bit more detail in here, but it's not really changed.

JUDGE SIPPEL: That sounds like it's a lit bit of a finesse on this.

If you want to let him testify as a fact witness, I have no problem. If he's got -- if he wants to cite the reasons why he thinks programming is sufficient, programming is similar, he could do that in a generic way. He doesn't have to go through the kinds of evidence that Mr. Cohen was citing to. Ι completely the witness's haven't read testimony yet, so I'm going to reserve on this for a time until I can get it focused. But in the meantime, I'm going to have both of you go back down and try and negotiate some of this stuff.

You even conceded there's a couple of paragraphs that maybe should come out.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I'll bet you're going to find more than a couple. I do not want to hear as a general proposition, I don't want to hear the party to the case that has the biggest interest in the outcome of the case trying to convince me that he is an expert in certain areas that are essential to the case. Do you know why? Because I think he's a bit prejudiced.

I'm supposed to get as neutral -now I understand that the witnesses as experts
are not 100 percent neutral in the sense that
they're being retained to give an opinion, but
there's an element of neutrality there that is
not going to be present with a party to the
case.

And I can rely on him for a lot of things, but I don't want to have to rely on him for expertise.

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, we are offering him as a fact witness. And if I might just give an example perhaps to give some clarification. It might help us in

1 | negotiating.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

An example of one of the things that they appear to be objecting to, WealthTV as a matter of course through the years has had some kind of apparatus on the sets that gives them some feedback on who's looking at their shows. One of the experts did a survey based on those data and he testified about his survey. Mr. Herring also looks at those data. He has been all along. He provides a count. He provides an update on the count in here. That's one of the things that's been updated. I'm sorry, it's an internet thing. It's not I have the facts wrong. But the on sets. basic idea is his company has been collecting this stuff. He had an expert opine on it, but he's also giving an account. He's added them up.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Why do I need him, if I got the expert? Why do I need him?

MR. ROSE: He's updating the count.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: What do you mean
2	updating it?
3	MR. ROSE: I think it's an on-
4	going count. I'm not exactly sure.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: And the witness
6	hasn't completed the count? In other words,
7	he's doing what he's paying the witness to do?
8	MS. WALLMAN: I believe the
9	witness has done some corrections after his
10	deposition, but as Mr. Cohen points out, there
11	weren't any rebuttal reports. So they aren't
12	in the report.
13	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, can I just
14	
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait just a second.
16	I still don't I have to be sure I'm
17	understanding this.
18	You would not be in a position
19	when the expert gets on the stand, you're
20	going to offer him, obviously you've got
21	the written testimony. And you would not be
22	in a position to say is there anything that

want to change or supplement? You 1 2 couldn't ask that question to him? MR. ROSE: I'm sure we could, Your 3 I just want to --4 Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: Couldn't he then 5 say yes, in fact, I didn't finish this aspect 6 here about listening to feedbacks on the 7 8 internet or something like that. And there would be some more information to give on 9 Then there might be an objection and we 10 11 go through that, but basically witnesses do have an opportunity to update their written 12 testimony as long as they're not changing it. 13 And now they're on notice anyway on it. But 14 why bring your principal -- why bring 15 licensee -- well, not the licensee, but why 16 bring this gentleman who owns all of the --17 who has so much at stake, why bring him into 18 Why does he have to think about this 19 this? He's got business things to think 20 21 about. MR. ROSE: Your Honor, it is his 22

business and he does look at this stuff as a matter of course.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure.

MR. ROSE: He's not trying to give an expert opinion. He's testifying as a fact witness. I think the idea of trying to work things out is probably good and we can probably limit the issues for you.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I want you to work hard on it because that's a thick piece of written testimony and I'm looking for a succinct story that says look, we tried to get this contract, we couldn't get it and why. They don't put theirs in writing. I put mine in writing. This, this, this is happening and that's why I'm being treated unfairly, if that's what the story is. But why he has to go into this stuff that he's paying good money to an expert who can tell me and think that I would want to put the expert aside to listen to him. That doesn't make any sense. It just makes no sense to me at all.

б

1.0

MR. ROSE: Just as a matter of timing and procedure, Your Honor, given that he's testifying in the next couple of days, would you want us to put in an amended thing after the cross examination has occurred, an amended direct testimony?

JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, not after cross examination has occurred. I want you to sit down with the other side and go through his testimony again in light of what I'm telling you and completely recast this. I mean it's going to need recasting. I'm not saying everything that Mr. Cohen is objecting to that you have to go along with it. I'm not into it that deep yet. But there should be a way that you can agree to 90 percent of what he's saying. You know where I'm coming from. If I have to go down it line by line, but that's going to take -- everybody is screaming about time here.

I'm willing to do things on the quick as much as I can. And if I've got to

sit down and go through these things line by 1 line, it's going to take a long time. 2 3 MR. ROSE: I understand, thank you. 4 Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: And I think that 5 your client has better things to do. 6 Now I'll tell you this, let me 7 give you an example. You can go back and tell 8 him this and if he's in the courtroom, he'll 9 hear me, but I'll tell you if the owners of 10 the Titanic came in and they wanted to explain 11 to me why the damn thing went down and I'm not 12 going to pay much attention to his experts 13 because he knows more than his experts do, I 14 don't think I'm going to listen to the owner 15 of the Titanic. I want to his story, but not 16 for that reason. 17 So this is just puzzling me to no 18 end, particularly from a party that's been 19 screaming about time. I mean this is how we 20 waste time. But that's got nothing to do with 21 22 the merits of the case. So --

1	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, can I just
2	
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't think
4	you have to. I want to leave it where it is.
5	MR. COHEN: We'll certainly sit
б	down with him this afternoon.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't want to get
8	into this back and forth stuff.
9	MR. COHEN: We'll sit down with
10	him. We're happy to do that as soon as we're
11	done with documents and admissions.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you, thank
13	you. No, I'm not going to put a deadline on
14	that. You let me know how it's going.
15	MR. COHEN: He's the first
16	witness.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's the first
18	witness?
19	MS. WALLMAN: Yes.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you move him
21	out of the first spot?
22	MS. WALLMAN: I'll explore it. I

1	think it would be highly disadvantageous to
2	us.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why?
4	MS. WALLMAN: Because he's the
5	person who is going to tell the story.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right, but who is
7	your second witness?
8	MS. WALLMAN: Our second witness
9	would be an expert, Sandy McGovern.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it's your
11	case and I'm not going to tell you how to try,
12	but I don't see in light of what the status of
13	the situation is now and I didn't create this,
14	that we can't you can't start your case
15	with an expert. He's not going to tell
16	anything different I wouldn't think than Mr.
17	Herring.
18	But on the other hand, if you need
19	more time, we'll find some reason. If you're
20	insisting on him going on first, we'll do
21	that.
22	I have a medical consultant I need to see and

1	I can go down and consult him while you're
2	doing this.
3	MR. ROSE: Can we report back at
4	say 4:30 or 5 this evening, let you know where
5	we stand after meeting with Mr. Cohen?
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure, you can give
7	me emails. Yes, I'll be here. I'll be here.
8	And we're going to break for lunch and maybe
9	you'll have another update by the time we come
10	back from lunch. Maybe we won't have to break
11	for lunch. Maybe we'll get everything in
12	before lunch.
13	So whatever happens, happens. You
14	know? That's the name of the game.
15	All right. So what's next on the
16	agenda. Next on the agenda is this other
17	witness from what's the name of that company.
18	It begins with a small letter and it goes into
19	capitals?
20	MR. ROSE: It's in DEMAND.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: iN DEMAND. Why do
22	we have to bother with subpoenaing them? Why

1	do we have to subpoena them? I got the same
2	question. Go ahead, I'm sorry.
3	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, part of
4	the Herring testimony relied on statements of
5	Mr. Jacobson that were objected to. Mr.
6	Jacobson is not present. Mr. Asch, who I
7	understand to be a subordinate of Mr.
8	Jacobson, has been called by Defendants to
9	testify.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, can you focus
11	a little bit on what do you need Mr. Jacobson
12	to what relevant issue to this case or what
13	issue in this case is Mr. Jacobson so relevant
14	and necessary that we have to subpoena him
15	here?
16	MS. WALLMAN: Mr. Jacobson was
17	widely quoted about the about Mojo.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: By who? By the
19	press?
20	MS. WALLMAN: In the press, yes,
21	Your Honor.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WALLMAN: And Mr. Asch not so 1 2 much. And if we have hearsay issue with respect to what Mr. Herring has read and has 3 used in understanding his competition, then as 4 a contingent matter, we would ask Your Honor 5 to consider, to allow us to bring Mr. Jacobson 6 into the courtroom. 7 JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's for 8 purposes of propping up the reliability of 9 newspaper articles? 10 MS. WALLMAN: It's for the purpose 11 of asking him whether he made the statements 12 in the newspaper articles. 13 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't read 14 newspaper articles with that in mind. I don't 15 16

newspaper articles with that in mind. I don't know who is going to read the newspaper articles. Even if they're in the record, unless you've got a live witness on the stand and he's going to be shown something, whether that's true or not. I don't pay attention to newspaper articles. They're hearsay upon hearsay upon hearsay upon hearsay.

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	So I don't pay attention to them.
2	Unless, there's a focus. If there's a focus
3	with the witness, then that's a different
4	story. So don'ŧ worry about propping up
5	newspaper reports. They're on their own.
6	So whatever was said in the
7	newspapers, I don't care about, as a general
8	proposition.
9	MS. WALLMAN: Well, for example,
10	there have been contradictory statements about
11	the demographic of Mojo. Mr. Jacobson has
12	said in the press it is 25 to 49. In other
13	testimony, including Mr. Asch's, it's referred
14	to as 18 to 49.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you could ask
16	Mr. Asch.
17	MS. WALLMAN: Sure, I believe I
18	can, Your Honor. I can try to do that. I
19	don't know if impeaching him with other
20	statements made by company officials.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, yes, you can.
22	But beyond the question of impeachment, if

Asch says he saw it one way and Mr. Jacobson said in the newspaper he saw it another way, then either one of them is correct. And one of them has to be right and one of them has to be wrong, unless the newspapers got it wrong. God forbid. Right?

MS. WALLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I think Mr. Asch can help us with that. I don't have anything against Mr. Jacobson, but why bother the guy if we don't need him, when time is always of the essence, I've been told...

All right, so I'm going to deny Jacobson to you. I'm going to deny that motion to issue a subpoena for Jacobson. If Asch turns out to be a calcitrant witness or if Asch is a reluctant witness or if Asch is in any way giving me a hard time, I'll reconsider, but if it appears that Asch is telling the truth and he knows enough about the situation to tell us what we need to know, then Mr. Jacobson can stay home or do whatever

1 he does. Is there anything else Okay. 2 pending as preliminary? 3 Everyone knows the ground rules 4 about the press? Unless you've got something 5 -- and you've got to be the judge in the first 6 instance, but I'm talking about stuff that's 7 really critical because its current 8 projections of what's going to happen as 9 opposed to ancient data with numbers that 10 really aren't going to mean anything today. 11 But you have to be the initial judge of that. 12 I'm all for letting the press in as much as I 13 can, simply for the reason that I don't want 14 to go in and out, in and out, in and out. 15 tried that once and I didn't -- I wasn't 16 correct what I did. 17 So let's do it -- I'm just telling 18 you this so that you're aware of what's going 19 I know everybody knows what the situation 20 on. 21 is.

All right, let's go forward.

1	goes first, WealthTV goes first with your
2	documents. Are they in
3	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, what we've
4	done, if I may
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir.
6	MR. COHEN: To try to expedite
7	this, we did exchange objections with each
8	other last week.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
10	MR. COHEN: And we were able to
11	clear away some of the exhibits on each side
12	and we're prepared to discuss our objections
13	to the Wealth exhibits, starting with number
14	one, if that would suit Your Honor.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. Any way you
16	can do it. Now if you don't are they in
17	binder form or you know is that it in the
18	looseleaf form, ma'am?
19	MS. WALLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Because what we did
21	on the other cases, we just identified the
22	number of tabs that were in a particular

1	volume. For purposes of the record, they're
2	marked. And then the reporter is going to
3	have to physically mark them after we leave
4	the courtroom. We don't have to sit here and
5	let every piece of paper get marked.
6	MR. COHEN: Yes, sir.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: But there was not.
8	much objection on anything that was going in,
9	so it worked pretty smoothly. You have
10	specific objections, I have to rule on them.
11	MR. COHEN: There are a number of
12	objections here, Your Honor.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: We'll have to take
14	them that way.
15	MR. COHEN: And we're prepared to
16	start. Do you want to start with Al? Any way
17	
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's get a proffer
19	first. Are you prepared to offer your first
20	exhibits in this case, Ms. Wallman?
21	MS. WALLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, and they

1	would be? Take the first volume and tell me
2	what the tab numbers are.
3	MS. WALLMAN: The first volume,
4	tab number that we're looking is WealthTV
5	Exhibit A1.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: A1, thank you. Is
7	it tabbed?
8	MS. WALLMAN: It is tabbed, Your
9	Honor.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: What are the tab
11	numbers?
12	MS. WALLMAN: The tab number is
13	A1.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: A1 through what?
15	MR. MILLS: I'm sorry, were these
16	renumbered now?
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean usually the
18	tabs go like from 1 to 50 or something like
19	that. But A1
20	MS. WALLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
21	We're happy to renumber as best suits Your
22	Honor. We had several transfers of these

exhibits that were exchanged with the
Defendants and we agreed on a numbering
system, but if it doesn't suit you, we'll do
it differently.
JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't have to
suit me, but it has to make some sense. If
there are independent exhibits within the one
volume, that is, separate exhibits, and it's
not all one exhibit, then it has to be
numbered. There were instructions starting
back with Judge Steinberg, who was pretty
specific on that.
MS. WALLMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE SIPPEL: So tell me what
we're dealing with, please.
I've got tabs are we talking
about the same thing? I've got tabs going
through 25.
(Pause.)
Why don't we go off the record?
Why don't we go off the record and get this
find out where we are.